

CAZON  
NR 60  
- A 56  
ca

GIPDUP

ONTARIO  
FISHERIES  
ADVISORY  
COUNCIL

ANNUAL REPORT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR  
APRIL 1, 1990 TO MARCH 31, 1991

ONTARIO FISHERIES ADVISORY COUNCIL  
ANNUAL REPORT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR  
APRIL 1, 1990 TO MARCH 31, 1991

EXPLANATORY NOTE

This report is submitted by the Ontario Fisheries Advisory Council to the Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Bud Wildman.

The contents of the report cover the 1990-91 fiscal year. During this period, Lyn McLeod was Minister from April 1 to September 6, and Bud Wildman was Minister from September 6 to March 31, 1991. The Council had two meetings during the 1990-91 fiscal year, one in July 1990 and the other one in January 1991. Although the recommendations of the Council's July meeting were addressed to Mrs. McLeod, the Minister's responses which appear in the report were written by Bud Wildman.

©1992, Queen's Printer for Ontario

Printed in Ontario, Canada

Single copies of this publication are available at no charge from the address noted below. Bulk orders will be charged \$2.00/copy.

For more information contact:

Ministry of Natural Resources  
Natural Resources Information Centre  
900 Bay Street  
Room M1-73, Macdonald Block  
Toronto, Ontario M7A 2C1

Tel: (416) 314-2000

4210  
(7.0 k P.R., 92 02 28)  
ISSN 0840-7495



Printed on  
recycled paper



Ontario Fisheries  
Advisory Council

Conseil Consultatif  
de l'Ontario  
sur les Pêches

Dr. E.J. Crossman, Chairman  
The Royal Ontario Museum  
Department of Ichthyology and Herpetology  
100 Queen's Park Crescent  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5S 2C6

Telephone: (416) 586-5759

Fax: (416) 586-5863

January 16, 1992

The Honourable C.J. Wildman  
Minister of Natural Resources  
Whitney Block, Queen's Park  
Toronto, Ontario  
M7A 1W3

Dear Mr. Wildman:

I take pleasure in presenting the Fourth Annual Report of your Council. As indicated, the information and activity reported on includes periods of responsibility of two ministers.

It is the continuing hope of the members of Council that the revenue from the Resident Sportfishing Licence will assist in the expansion of the Fisheries Program beyond what might otherwise have been possible.

This report contains a new approach to the responsibility of indicating to residents and non-residents the revenue and expenditures of the Fisheries Program.

Sincerely,



Dr. E. J. Crossman  
Chairman  
Ontario Fisheries Advisory Council



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115484339>

ONTARIO  
FISHERIES  
ADVISORY  
COUNCIL

ANNUAL REPORT  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR  
APRIL 1, 1990 TO MARCH 31, 1991



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

## A. INTRODUCTION

1. RESIDENT SPORT FISHING LICENCE (RSFL)	1
2. THE COUNCIL	1
3. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COUNCIL	1
4. MEETINGS	1
5. LIASON WITH FISHERIES POLICY BRANCH, OMNR	2

---

## B. THE FISHERIES BUDGET

1. REVENUE FROM RSFL	3
2. ALLOCATION OF RSFL AND REGULAR FUNDS	3
3. EXPENDITURES - USE OF THE COMBINED RSFL AND REGULAR FUNDS (SINGLE BUDGET)	4
4. REVIEW OF THE FISHERIES PROGRAM	6

---

## C. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MINISTER AND MINISTER'S RESPONSES

1A. ONE FISHERIES BUDGET - MERGING OF THE RSFL FUNDS WITH THE REGULAR FUNDS	7
1B. FURTHER TO MERGING OF THE REGULAR AND RSFL FUNDS	7
2. TERMS OF MEMBERSHIP ON THE COUNCIL	7
3. CONTROL OF THE SPREAD OF ZEBRA MUSSELS	8
4. THE THREAT POSED BY PURPLE LOOSESTRIFE	8
5. LAKE TROUT BACKCROSS REVIEW	9
6. FISHERIES INFORMATION PACKAGES FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS	9

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

7. THE "IDEAL" FISHERIES BUDGET	9
8. YOUTH FISHERIES EDUCATION PROGRAM	9
9. FISHING LICENCE REVIEW	10
10. WATERPOWER PROJECTS AND FISH	11
11. NATIVE AFFAIRS AND FISHERIES ISSUES	11
12. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE COUNCIL IN REGARDS TO THE RSFL PROGRAM	12
D. OTHER COUNCIL ACTIVITIES	13
E. PUBLIC CONTACT WITH THE COUNCIL	13
F. SUMMARY	14

# A. INTRODUCTION

## 1. RESIDENT SPORT FISHING LICENCE (RSFL):

A Resident Sport Fishing Licence (RSFL) for Ontario residents was introduced in January of 1987. All Ontarians aged 18 to 64 require a licence to fish, with the following exceptions; Status Indians fishing on their reserves or treaty areas, Senior Citizens, and those with a mobility or intellectual impairment requiring the assistance of another person, or device. The introduction of the licence followed extensive public consultation which demonstrated significant support from the public and major client groups. Public support for the licence was given on the basis of statements made by the Minister of Natural Resources that the revenue raised from the sale of the licence would be used solely to expand the provincial fisheries program. In order to meet these conditions, the Ontario Government committed the revenue raised to an expanded fisheries program and the Minister of Natural Resources promised the creation of a citizen's council to advise him on the expenditures of the fisheries program and to ensure that the provincial fisheries program was appropriately expanded.

## 2. THE COUNCIL:

The Ontario Fisheries Advisory Council was established by Order in Council dated June 25, 1987. The Council's first term of office ended on June 24, 1990. As required by Management Board guidelines respecting agencies, boards and commissions, a sunset review of this agency was undertaken. Following this review, the Ontario Fisheries Advisory Council was re-established for an additional 5 year term, ending June 24, 1995. The Council consists of twelve members chosen by the Minister to reflect the geographical, philosophical and socio-economic diversity of the Province's fisheries users. Members are chosen for their demonstrated concern for provincial fisheries resources and in several instances, a reliance on the economic benefits of healthy fisheries. The present Council is chaired by Dr. E.J. Crossman of the Department of Ichthyology and Herpetology, Royal Ontario Museum. Vice-chairperson of the Council is Ms. Kristine Carter of London. Organizational representatives on the Council are Mr. Don MacLachlan of Wawa, representing the Northern Ontario Tourist Outfitters Association, Mr. Rick Morgan of Lakefield, representing the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, and Mr. George Purvis of Gore Bay, representing the

Ontario Fish Producers' Association. Members-at-large are: Mr. Lorne Allard of Thunder Bay, Mrs. Rejeanne Anthon of Mississauga, Mr. Pat DiCiocco of Niagara Falls, Mr. Steve Green of Kenora, Mr. Marcel Harvey of Elliot Lake, Mr. Tom Henderson of Englehart and Dr. Tom Whillans of Peterborough. The term of appointment of five members: Patrick DiCiocco, Steve Green, Don MacLachlan, Rick Morgan and George Purvis expires on June 24, 1991.

## 3. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF COUNCIL:

The terms of reference of the Council are:

1. To advise the Minister on expenditures of Ontario's fisheries management program.
2. To appraise current fisheries management programs carried out by the Ministry and recommend methods to improve them.
3. To review proposed major fisheries programs and provincial policies prior to adoption.
4. To investigate and advise on new or potential sources of revenue under the fisheries program.
5. To make recommendations to the Minister on matters that are referred to the Council.
6. To make reports and/or release information to the angling public after approval by the Minister.
7. The Council may initiate discussions on and advise the Minister on matters that they have not been specifically charged with.

## 4. MEETINGS:

The Council, as a whole, is to meet a minimum of two and a maximum of four times per year. In order to facilitate better understanding of fisheries management across Ontario, the Council has met in various locations throughout the province. In its fourth year, (ending March 31, 1991) meetings of the Council were held in the Ministry's Northeastern and Central Regions.

The members of the Council are eligible for a per diem for the time they spend in meetings. The per diem rates are: \$225 for the Chairman, \$175 for the Vice-Chairper-

son and \$150 for the members. Travel and other legitimate expenses incurred by members in fulfilling their duties are also reimbursable. The cost to the fisheries program for the coordination and operation of the Council, including production of its Annual Report, totalled \$64,829 in fiscal year 1990-91. This includes the salary of the Secretariat to the Council for that portion of his time spent on Council duties.

## 5. LIAISON WITH FISHERIES POLICY BRANCH, OMNR:

Since the inception of the Council, an employee of Fisheries Branch (now Fisheries Policy Branch) has been appointed to provide liaison with the Ministry and to constitute a Secretariat for the Council. Most of the

work on Minutes of meetings and first draft of Annual Reports is carried out by that person. Originally that assistance was provided by Jim Hamilton. In this fiscal year, the liaison, and many other services, were carried out by Jim Hamilton until June, by Gareth Goodchild until December and then by Raymond Biette for the remainder of the year.

The Council would like to acknowledge with thanks the past assistance of Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Goodchild.

As noted above (under Meetings), a proportion of the salary of the liaison individual commensurate with time spent on Council business (and away from a variety of other Ministry duties) is charged to the fisheries program.

## B. THE FISHERIES BUDGET

### 1. REVENUE FROM RSFL

The Council was advised that as of March 31, 1991 total revenue generated from the sales of the Resident Sport Fishing Licence (November 1986 to March 1991) has amounted to \$41.4 million, including \$11.5 million raised during fiscal year 90/91. This revenue is the amount of money remitted by issuers to the Ministry of Natural Resources and does not include the 5% issuing fee which is retained by issuers. Revenue has increased 17% over last year and is mainly accounted for by the increase in licence fees for both the seasonal and four-day licence (to \$11.50 from \$10.00 for the seasonal and to \$6.50 from \$5.00 for the four-day licence) that took effect on January 1, 1990.

**Table 1** shows the revenue raised each year from the sale of the seasonal and the four-day Resident Sport Fishing Licence as well as the cumulative total for the year.

All revenue received from the sale of the resident sport fishing licence goes into the consolidated revenue fund of the Province of Ontario. The Ministry receives an annual allocation to conduct the provincial fisheries program. Revenue raised from the sale of the resident licence, however, has not been fully allocated to the Ministry's fisheries program. The cumulative shortfall in allocation up to the end of this fiscal year is \$1.8 million. For further explanation of this shortfall in allocation to the fisheries program, refer to Section C (1B).

TABLE 1 – REVENUE FROM RESIDENT SPORT FISHING LICENCE  
(1.0 = \$1,000,000)

Fiscal Year	Seasonal Licence \$	4-Day Licence \$	Total \$	Cumulative Total \$
1986/87	1.4	0.0	1.4	1.4
1987/88	9.0	0.2	9.2	10.6
1988/89	9.3	0.2	9.5	20.1
1989/90	9.6	0.2	9.8	29.9
1990/91	11.2	0.3	11.5	41.4

### 2. ALLOCATION OF RSFL AND REGULAR FUNDS

There is one fisheries program in Ontario and only one fisheries program budget, made up of funds from regular sources and from the resident licence fees.

For the fiscal year 1990-91, the fisheries program was allocated, as shown in **Table 2**, \$52.4 million (single budget), made up of funds from regular sources (\$41.7 million) and from the resident licence fees (\$10.7 million). The licence allocation of \$10.7 million constituted 20.4% of the total fisheries program budget. The total allocation of \$52.4 million, represented a 3.76% increase over last year's allocation of \$50.5 million.

TABLE 2 FISHERIES BUDGET  
ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990-91

Funds	\$ Millions	% of Total (\$52.4 M)
RSFL	10.7	20.4
Regular	41.7	79.6
Total (Combined)	52.4	100

The comparisons of the allocations (RSFL and regular funds) for fiscal year 1990-91 with the past four years are shown in **Table 3**. The total allocations to the fisheries budget have increased each year since the licence was first introduced, from \$32.2 million in fiscal year 1986-87 to \$52.4 million in 1990-91. The licence funding component has increased from \$0.7 million in fiscal year 1986-

87 to \$10.7 million in fiscal year 1989-90, but remained unchanged at \$10.7 million for fiscal year 1990-91. Over the same period, the regular funding component has increased also from \$31.5 million in fiscal year 1986-87 to \$39.8 million in fiscal 1989-90, and then increased to \$41.7 million for fiscal year 1990-91.

TABLE 3 FISHERIES BUDGET

ALLOCATIONS (1.0 = \$1,000,000)

Fiscal Year	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91
Licence Allocation	0.7	8.2	9.3	10.7	10.7
Regular Funds	31.5	35.9	36.8	39.8	41.7
Total	32.2	44.1	46.1	50.5	52.4

### 3. EXPENDITURES - USE OF THE COMBINED RSFL AND REGULAR FUNDS (SINGLE BUDGET)

The annual allocation that the Ministry receives each year is used to fund the various components of the fisheries program throughout the province.

For fiscal year 1990-91, the expenditures of the combined RSFL and regular funds (single budget), as a percentage of the total expenditure (\$57.9 million), for each of the eight components of the fisheries program (described below) in the eight administrative regions of the Ministry (listed below) and main office were as shown in **Table 4**. The last row in Table 4 shows the total

expenditures for each location in dollars (millions). For example, Northwestern Region (NW) spent 3.33%, or \$1.9 million of the single fisheries budget on enforcement, 1.23%, or \$0.712 million on public service, and spent a total of \$5.2 million to manage the fisheries in the Northwestern Region during fiscal year 1990-91. Similarly, Central Region (C) spent \$6.1 million to conduct the fisheries programs in Central Region.

The last column in Table 4 shows the expenditures by components at the provincial level. For example, throughout the province, 24% of the total fisheries budget, or \$13.9 million, was spent on enforcement.

**TABLE 4 FISHERIES BUDGET**

**EXPENDITURES (%) OF THE TOTAL (\$57.9 MILLION)  
BY COMPONENT AND LOCATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990-91**

Component \ Location	NW	NC	N	NE	AL	E	C	SW	MO <sup>1</sup>	PROV <sup>2</sup>
<b>Administration</b>	1.90	1.70	3.88	2.52	2.50	2.50	2.87	2.16	4.45	25.03
<b>Inventory and Assessment</b>	0.95	1.79	0.80	1.75	3.60	1.98	1.57	3.12	1.03	16.62
<b>Population/Habitat Management</b>	0.85	0.62	0.65	1.00	0.57	0.40	0.82	0.40	2.84	8.14
<b>Enforcement</b>	3.33	2.15	1.88	4.01	2.71	2.78	2.84	3.50	0.80	24.0
<b>Public Service</b>	1.23	0.09	0.16	0.24	0.14	0.16	0.40	0.33	1.67	4.43
<b>Research</b>	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.12	1.19	0.06	0.30	3.85	5.73
<b>Fish Culture/Stocking</b>	0.02	0.82	1.00	2.09	0.57	0.82	1.23	1.16	1.74	9.44
<b>Minor Capital</b>	0.46	0.48	0.23	0.87	0.22	0.55	0.62	0.92	2.26	6.61
<b>Total Expenditures (\$ millions)</b>	5.2	4.5	5.0	7.2	6.1	6.0	6.1	6.9	10.9	57.9

1 Main Office

2 Provincial Total

The eight components of the fisheries program include the following activities:

Administration	Includes licence production, distribution and accounting, but does not include an additional 5% distribution fee for private licence issuers. It also includes all matters related to administration of the fisheries program, including employee benefits and publication costs.
Inventory and Assessment	Investigation of fish communities and their habitats including, district habitat and population evaluation, aquatic habitat inventory, user surveys and assessment units.
Population and Habitat Mgmt.	Improvements to spawning areas, stream and lake rehabilitation, construction of fishways, and protecting fisheries resources through plan input and review.
Enforcement	Salary, equipment and operational costs for enforcement.
Public Service	Providing public information, producing fishing brochures and maps, funding the community fisheries involvement program (CFIP), education programs, provincial fishing areas, and public involvement and extension.
Fisheries Research	Research on the Great Lakes and inland lakes to acquire and transfer science for management decisions. Examples include research on: environmental effects of timber management, impacts of zebra mussel invasion on Great Lakes aquatic communities, rehabilitation of lake trout stocks, impacts of stocking hatchery fish over native populations, and restoring atlantic salmon populations in Lake Ontario.
Fish Culture/Stocking	All costs associated with the production of hatchery fish and stocking or transfer of hatchery and natural fish.
Minor Capital	Costs related to storage facilities and office facilities for assessment units, culture stations and access points and major capital expansion of the fish culture system.

The locations referred to in Table 4 are:

NW - Northwestern Region located in Kenora  
 NC - North Central Region located in Thunder Bay  
 N - Northern Region located in Cochrane  
 NE - Northeastern Region located in Sudbury

AL - Algonquin Region located in Huntsville

E - Eastern Region located in Kempsville

C - Central Region located in Aurora

SW - Southwestern Region located in London

MO - Main Office located in Toronto and Maple

In **Table 5**, the expenditures (as a % of total expenditures) from the single fisheries budget (combined RSFL and regular funds) by component for the fiscal year 1990-91 are compared at the provincial level with those for the past four fiscal years; 1989-90, 1988-89, 1987-88 and 1886-87. The total expenditures for each year are

also shown. It should be noted that total expenditures are greater than the year-start allocations as the total expenditures reflect any mid-year adjustments to address additional allocations and adjustments occurring during the fiscal year.

TABLE 5

EXPENDITURES(%) OF TOTAL FROM THE SINGLE FISHERIES BUDGET

Component \ Fiscal Year	86/87	87/88	88/89	89/90	90/91
<b>Administration</b>	36.7	29.6	23.8	20.0	25.0
<b>Inventory and Assessment</b>	13.9	18.6	17.9	23.0	16.6
<b>Population and Habitat Management</b>	11.9	10.0	10.2	7.0	8.1
<b>Enforcement</b>	2.7	10.4	18.7	19.5	24.0
<b>Public Service</b>	3.7	5.0	4.8	4.1	4.4
<b>Research</b>	5.8	6.1	6.8	8.3	5.7
<b>Fish Culture/Stocking</b>	12.6	11.2	11.2	12.2	9.4
<b>Minor Capital</b>	12.6	9.1	6.5	5.9	6.6
<b>Expenditures Total Budget (in \$ millions)</b>	<b>\$39.2</b>	<b>\$46.6</b>	<b>\$49.9</b>	<b>\$51.5</b>	<b>\$57.9</b>

Although there have been significant increases in fisheries expenditures since the licence was introduced, there also have been added demands to meet new priorities and new commitments. As a result, expenditures for some field operations have not increased proportionately.

#### 4. REVIEW OF THE FISHERIES PROGRAM

At the Council's July meeting in Sault Ste. Marie, North-eastern Region reported on its Regional fisheries program including a review of the use of the RSFL and regular funds. Following this report, the Council, with the Regional and District staff, toured Tarentorous Hatch-

ery, the municipal hatchery and the Sea Lamprey Control Centre. Similarly, Central Region reported on its Regional fisheries program to the Council, including the use of the combined RSFL and regular funds (single or merged format) at its January meeting in Toronto. Central Region made presentations to Council on the fisheries programs directed at fish habitat protection and rehabilitation, on the inventory and assessment work undertaken by the fisheries assessment units in the Region and on the progress of the rehabilitation of Atlantic salmon in the Credit River and Wilmot Creek. In addition, Eastern Region prepared a report on the use of the RSFL funds in its Region. This report is available from Eastern Region.

## C. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MINISTER AND MINISTER'S RESPONSES

### 1A. ONE FISHERIES BUDGET – MERGING OF THE RSFL FUNDS WITH THE REGULAR FUNDS:

The Chairman informed Council that he had met with the Minister and that she had expressed a desire for the Council to put more emphasis on reviewing the fisheries program as a whole rather than focus on RSFL. The Chairman thought that this new approach would not pose a problem as long as the Council still continued to get the detail on RSFL projects/programs. He expressed to the Council, the need of the Minister to have more advice at the program level rather than the project level.

The Council recommended to the Minister that: Council has considered the Minister's suggestion that the fisheries budgets be lumped together. Council views it to be appropriate and desirable that it reviews the complete budget and advise the Minister on the fisheries program as a whole; however, Council still wishes to see the details of RSFL portion of the budget in order to be able to determine the additional achievements accomplished by Fisheries Branch with the increased funding.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"In reviewing my predecessor's correspondence, I understand that the Council was having some difficulty over how to respond to information provided under the new merged format of the base budget and RSFL budget codes. I have been advised that you have met with Fisheries staff to discuss this situation, and that staff will make a presentation to Council at the January meeting on future presentation format.

I understand the Northeastern Region presentation at your last meeting dealt with this issue and was well received. I can assure you that the Ministry will endeavour to ensure that the Council retains every opportunity to inform the public about the expansion of the Fisheries Program as a result of the inclusion of RSFL revenue."

Further, "As I mentioned, I recognize the Council's hesitation regarding the merging of the base and RSFL budgets. However, I am pleased that you consider it worthwhile to review the whole program and not just the twenty per cent attributable to the RSFL revenue."

### 1B. FURTHER TO MERGING OF THE REGULAR AND RSFL FUNDS:

In accordance with the Minister's request at the January meeting, Council repeated its recommendation made at the July meeting on the merging of the budgets.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I understand Council's interest in accounting for the expansion of the Fisheries Program as a result of the additional revenue generated from the licence. However, as I stated previously, there cannot be a guarantee that the revenue from the licence will be returned to the Fisheries Program as "ear-marked" funds. This is not possible within the fiscal rules of the Provincial Government. In addition, the equivalent funds that are transferred by Management Board from the licence sales to the fisheries program are combined with the regular funds to deliver one overall Fisheries Program. The distinction between the two budgets is artificial. I have asked the Ministry's Fisheries Policy Branch to discuss the relationship between the two budgets with the Council as well as with the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters and other concerned groups."

### 2. TERMS OF MEMBERSHIP ON THE COUNCIL

Council reiterated a concern that members could serve only a maximum of two terms. Council understands the Management Board guidelines, however, it felt that, in particular, if a designated member was performing well on the Council and if the member agency wished to nominate the representative for a third term, then it should be able to do so.

The Council recommends to the Minister that: The Minister go to Management Board and request that the criteria for re-appointment to the Council be amended. They request member agencies (NOTO, OFAH, OFPA) be given the option of nominating a representative for a third term. The Minister would still retain the option to reject any candidate put forward.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"While I appreciate the Council's concern over the length of term for members, I cannot recommend that Management Board guidelines be changed to accommodate the Council. This policy governs all provincial agencies, boards and commissions."

### 3. THE CONTROL OF THE SPREAD OF ZEBRA MUSSELS

At the July meeting, a representative of Fisheries Branch made a presentation to the Council on the Ministry's program to control the spread of zebra mussels in Ontario.

The Council applauded the news that a budget request was being prepared for submission to Cabinet. Members felt that too little was being done to tackle the introduction of exotics into Ontario. They also felt that the problem should be approached from an ecosystem perspective rather than looking at individual problem species like zebra mussels. The Council also felt that the federal government's involvement and monetary commitment to date had been very meagre. Voluntary guidelines which are being promoted by the federal government were inadequate and should be replaced by established regulations that can be enforced (eg., control of boat traffic and baitfish transfer).

The Council recommended to the Minister that: Council wishes to express support for any initiative that will result in new funds being made available for the zebra mussel program. It would also like to emphasize that any funding for zebra mussels not be diverted from the current fisheries program and that the program investigate the broader perspective of exotic introductions.

Council also recommended that: the Minister examine the Federal/Provincial agreements that address the issue of the spread of exotics through such items as ballast water discharge. Council also asks the Minister to pass on its concern to the federal government about the lack of federal concern regarding the priorities and funding issues around the introduction of foreign organisms.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I share the Council's concern over the potential effect of zebra mussels on the aquatic ecosystem. The zebra mussel infestation is a high priority for the Ministry. I can assure you that the Ministry will be examining all measures to ensure that its concerns are expressed at all levels of government. The approach taken to address this issue will be varied and include research, assessment, and public communication measures in an effort to find a means of controlling the mussel and to mitigate the effects of its spread."

Because of illness of the Ministry's Zebra Mussel Coordinator, the Council's scheduled update on the Zebra Mussel Program at the January meeting was postponed until the June 1991 meeting.

### 4. THE THREAT POSED BY PURPLE LOOSESTRIFE

Council received a news release issued by the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters concerning the rapid establishment of the undesirable plant, purple loosestrife. Council expressed concern about the spread of this plant and sent this news release to the Minister requesting information on initiatives taken to control the spread of purple loosestrife.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I have noted the Council's views on the threat posed by purple loosestrife. The Ministry has been examining the options available to control the spread of this aggressive species. These options include physical removal, selective chemical spraying and biological control. While physical removal and selective chemical spraying are effective methods of controlling small stands of loosestrife, neither of these actions is practical when the stand is extensive and well established. The use of biological agents to control purple loosestrife may prove to be a better option.

Current research is focusing on the use of natural enemies which are found in Europe to control purple loosestrife. Three beetle species are presently undergoing final screening at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Quarantine facility in Blacksburg, Virginia. When results of these tests are made available in one to two years, the appropriate agencies in Ontario, including the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, will review their applicability. Great care must be taken when introducing additional exotic species to ensure that new problems are not created.

In the interim, the Ministry and other agencies have obtained consultant assistance in assembling data on habitat colonization by purple loosestrife. This will provide information for the development of options for a management plan. As well, several organizations are examining the possibility of developing information pamphlets to increase public awareness of purple loosestrife. Also, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food is considering declaring purple loosestrife a noxious weed."

## 5. LAKE TROUT BACKCROSS REVIEW

Council discussed the review and the fact that public and commercial fishermen have been asked to keep harvest levels equivalent to 45 per cent lake trout and 55 per cent backcross. Council feels that MNR has no methodology for determining accurate harvest levels and whether numbers are being achieved. Therefore, commercial fishermen should not be asked to reduce their catch.

The Council recommended to the Minister that: the Ministry should eliminate the requirements regarding lake trout and backcross harvest ratios unless methodologies exist that can indicate that harvest levels are being achieved and that these have been, or will soon be implemented. Other methods should be sought to prevent harvest from exceeding these levels.

### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I note the Council's views on the harvest of lake trout and backcross. Total mortality, which is the sum of mortality from natural causes and fishing, is widely used by all Great Lake resource management agencies to assess the state of fish populations. The Council may have misinterpreted the actions of the Ministry in this regard. I am advised that the totals of 45 per cent and 55 per cent apply to mortality rates which are minimum target levels.

While I appreciate the Council's concerns, it is a rate that is comparatively easy to estimate from conventional sources such as index netting data. The estimate of total mortality does not require information on harvest levels but only samples of fish which are reasonably representative of the age structure of the population beyond a certain age. Ministry evidence suggests that, at current harvest rates, these mortality levels are being exceeded. The Ministry is examining all options to minimize current levels, including limitations on commercial and angler harvests."

## 6. FISHERIES INFORMATION PACKAGE FOR ELECTED OFFICIALS

At the March 1988 meeting, Council recommended to the Minister that fisheries information packages, to inform elected officials on the value of aquatic resources, be developed and distributed. In view of the upcoming election in September, Council suggested that it would be timely to have these information packages available for this fall.

### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I agree with the Council that an information package for elected officials would be a useful tool to help promote the value of fisheries habitat and other aspects of the aquatic resource. As your members know, communication is an important part of the Strategic Plan for Ontario Fisheries, and would entail the production of information packages for elected officials, the general public, and client groups."

## 7. THE "IDEAL" FISHERIES BUDGET

A request was made at the November 1987 Council meeting for the Ministry to provide the Council with a description of an "ideal" budget. It was felt that the government and the Council would better understand funding problems if all parties had some concept of what Fisheries Branch considered an "ideal" budget. To date nothing has been provided.

### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"The Council also requested a description of an "ideal" budget. I recognize that the demand for environmental and resource management initiatives across the province would contribute to an ideal aquatic ecosystem management program costing hundreds of millions of dollars. I am confident, however, that the Strategic Plan for Ontario Fisheries represents, to a large extent, an ideal program to effectively manage and restore aquatic ecosystems in Ontario. Ministries involved in implementing SPOF II will request increases in their programs which are in keeping with the economic situation and the need for urgent and effective action in aquatic ecosystem management."

Council, at its January meeting, expressed dissatisfaction with the response received as Council expected specific information on the dollars required (eg. \$100 million or \$75 million, etc.) to adequately manage an optimum fisheries program in Ontario. Council agreed to defer this matter until another time.

## 8. YOUTH FISHERIES EDUCATION PROGRAM

Council member, Tom Henderson, reported on his involvement with the Steering Committee of the Youth Fisheries Education Program (YFEP). Mr. Henderson expressed his displeasure with the progress toward implementation of the program to date. First, the Ministry of Education has not given strong enough support to

using the manuals in the curriculum. Second, in order to be consistent with Project WILD and Focus on Forests, MNR's Provincial Education Committee is trying to make workshops for teachers, on the use of the manuals, mandatory, not optional. Further, Mr. Henderson indicated that he was not in agreement with the Ministry's suggestion that the manuals be available for sale. In Mr. Henderson's opinion, the manuals should be provided to the appropriate teachers at no cost. The Council supported this position. To ensure effective implementation of this program, Tom Henderson proposed three recommendations for the Minister to consider. The Council accepted his recommendations.

The Council recommended to the Minister that:

1. To assist teachers with the implementation of YFEP in the schools, Council recommends that the workshops for teachers on applying the manuals (Fish Ways) be optional, and not mandatory as proposed by the Ministry of Natural Resources' Education Committee.
2. To help make teachers aware of the program, Council recommends that the Ministry of Natural Resources provide at least two manuals (more where required) to the Science or Geography Specialist or Supervisor of every school board in the province, and that the Ministry place announcements in the five affiliated magazines of the Ontario Teacher's Federation.
3. That the Minister of Natural Resources talk to the Minister of Education to ensure that YFEP is implemented effectively in the schools.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I share the concern of the Council in wishing to ensure effective implementation of the Youth Fisheries Education Program in Ontario's schools. I have spoken on several occasions with my colleague, the Minister of Education, regarding this topic. We recognize the great value to our youth of instruction regarding our fisheries resources.

I believe that the best way to implement this educational program in the schools, as well as Project WILD and Focus on Forests, is to have mandatory workshops for teachers on the use of these manuals. Research on introducing new curriculum materials to schools supports this view. Since the material in the Fish Ways manual has a philosophy and approach that are consistent with Project WILD and Focus on Forests, there is

no need to duplicate our efforts. Accordingly, workshops for teachers on the use of the Fish Ways manual would be optional for those 15,000 or more teachers who have already attended workshops on Project WILD or Focus on Forests.

I appreciate your interest in a co-ordinated communications effort to make teachers aware of the Fish Ways manuals. The Council's recommendation that announcements be placed in the Ontario Teacher's Federation magazines is excellent, and will become a part of the implementation plan for Fish Ways. I also appreciate the promotional value of providing manuals to Science and Geography Coordinators. These co-ordinators are critical to the implementation of the program as they do a great deal of in-service work with their teachers. Co-ordinators who have attended a Ministry workshop will be sent a Fish Ways manual free of charge as the Ministry believes that the co-ordinators should have a good understanding of the Ministry's approach. Other co-ordinators will become a primary target audience for the initial workshops on the use of Fish Ways."

#### 9. FISHING LICENCE REVIEW

Council was informed that the Ministry is undertaking a review of all fishing licences. The purpose of this review is to develop a rationale for the number and types of licences available, a multi-year fee schedule, and a rationale for issuers' fees. Council expressed a number of concerns in regards to this review. These concerns were:

1. The terms of reference for the committee did not include the Council's 1987 review and recommendations on fishing licences;
2. There is no Council representation on the review committee;
3. The review of fishing licence fees is one of the roles of the Council;
4. Wildlife licences and fees should be addressed at the same time;
5. The time allowed for the review is too short for public input;
6. Terms of reference should include examining methods to collect revenue from habitat consumers, such as developers;

7. The impacts of higher fees on both reducing angling opportunities and hampering the promotion of catch and release fishing need to be considered.

Council recommended that: the Minister provides the Council with the opportunity to comment on the draft report of this licence review at Council's June 1991 meeting.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I appreciate the Council's interest in the work of the Fishing Licence Review Committee. I welcome the Council's comments on this review, and thank Council member Kristine Carter for agreeing to participate and represent the Council. When the committee has prepared a draft report of its review, I will ask the Council for its comments. However, the time for the review of fishing licences has been extended because a number of complementary matters related to the review, including wildlife issues, must also be addressed. As a result, it is unlikely that a report will be available for the Council's meeting in June. A draft report should be available by August."

### 10. WATERPOWER PROJECTS AND FISH

The Council expressed concern about the potential adverse impacts of waterpower undertakings on the fisheries resources and made the following recommendation:

The Council has grave concerns about the impact on the provincial fisheries of any increase in number of waterpower undertakings on Ontario's waterbodies. The Council asks that the Minister pass this concern to his colleague, the Minister of Energy. Further, Council would be pleased to receive from the Minister of Natural Resources specific information on how the Minister of Energy and the Minister of Natural Resources will address fisheries concerns related to waterpower projects.

#### MINISTER'S RESPONSE:

"I appreciate the Council's concern for the protection of the fisheries resources from the potential adverse effects of developing waterpower and have shared your comments with my colleague, the Honourable Jenny Carter, Minister of Energy.

In keeping with the new priorities of the Ministry which focus on protection and rehabilitation, the Ministry is

presently reviewing its role in waterpower undertakings, as well as its role in relation to that of the Ministry of Energy in addressing these matters. When this review has been completed, I will inform Council of the decisions made. In the interim, the Ministry continues to review all waterpower projects to ensure no net loss to the fisheries. This is achieved by requiring the proponent to mitigate all adverse effects on the fisheries. Further, where mitigation cannot prevent loss to the fisheries, the proponent must compensate for this loss. This compensation is developed in agreement with the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans. As you know, when work is proposed, which would result in the loss of fish habitat, this Department must be approached, in accordance with section 35(2) of the Fisheries Act, for possible authorization of the work. The implementation and the costs for compensation are the responsibility of the proponent.

I note that the Council will be discussing the topic of waterpower and fisheries concerns at its next meeting in Timmins. Ministry staff would be pleased to outline the steps that the Ministry takes to protect the fisheries resources from waterpower undertakings. I encourage the Council to invite staff from the Ministry of Energy to the meeting in Timmins to discuss their Ministry's role in developing waterpower projects."

### 11. NATIVE AFFAIRS AND FISHERIES ISSUES

The Council expressed concern about a potential conflict of interest in the fact that the Minister has responsibility for both native affairs and the management of natural resources.

Council recommended to the Minister that: Although the Council does not wish to comment on whether native claims for fish, wildlife, and lands are valid or otherwise, the Council is concerned that the Premier has asked the same person to be both the Minister of Natural Resources and Minister of Native Affairs. As fisheries resources and fisheries programs are concerns of the Council, the Council wishes the Minister well in what might be perceived as competitive demands, and asks the Minister to always keep conservation and the law first and foremost in all dealings with potentially competing demands. The Council also asks that he ensure that concerned non-natives have meaningful opportunities for comments before final agreements are signed or decisions on allocations are made.

#### **MINISTER'S RESPONSE:**

"I have noted the Council's views on my dual responsibilities as Minister of Natural Resources and Minister Responsible for Native Affairs.

As you know, the Ontario Government is committed to recognizing the inherent rights of Ontario's aboriginal people. The Government is also committed to negotiating aboriginal self-government and improving the quality of life of the province's aboriginal people. One of the keys to native self-government is access to natural resources, such as fish and wildlife. Thus, I appreciate the Council's concerns that aboriginal issues can affect the interests of the Council. However, as I mentioned to Council members at the dinner meeting, conservation of the resource will be the prime consideration in all decisions on aboriginal access to resources. In keeping with a Supreme Court of Canada decision in the *Sparrow* case in May 1990, the aboriginal people of this country have the right to fish for food, for personal consumption, or ceremonial use within the community in their traditional territory. The Court also ruled that while Aboriginal and Treaty rights are constitutional rights which ordinarily take precedence over federal or provincial laws that are inconsistent with these rights, such laws may continue to apply to aboriginal people where they can be justified on grounds such as conservation or public safety. One of the Government's responses to the *Sparrow* case has been to modify its enforcement policy, as you are aware, to recognize the rights of aboriginal people to hunt and fish for food. This policy will ensure the conservation of fish and wildlife populations, sound natural resource management and the protection of public safety.

The Council's input and advice with respect to the Ministry's interim enforcement policy was of great assistance as the final revisions to the policy were being considered. I understand that the Deputy Minister, Mr. George Tough, recently sent you a more detailed letter regarding the Council's review and comments on the policy. I will be soliciting the Council's input on a number of other issues related to policies and strategies that are being developed on aboriginal peoples' access to natural resources."

#### **12. THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE COUNCIL IN REGARDS TO THE RSFL PROGRAM**

Council agreed to present to the Minister for his personal consideration and response the philosophy of the Council as it applies to the Sport Fishing Licence Program. To this regard, the Council asks the Minister to recognize that in the minds of the members of the Council, the philosophy of the Resident Sport Fishing Licence Program should be the provision of more fish on the end of anglers' lines and of more quality, angling opportunities.

#### **MINISTER'S RESPONSE:**

"While I appreciate the Council's views on this matter, I do not agree with this approach. The Ministry's policy is to view the Fisheries Program as one overall program. This recognizes that any improvement in the aquatic habitat will benefit the whole of the resource and all of its varied users. This position is consistent with the overall provincial strategy for Ontario's fisheries (SPOF II) developed through extensive consultation with a variety of interest groups."

## D. OTHER COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Not all of the business of the Ontario Fisheries Advisory Council (OFAC) is obvious in the recommendations it makes to the Minister (Section C). At times subjects resulting in direct recommendations to the Minister form a minor part of meetings. Other aspects of business of Council in this fiscal year include the following: 1) Representation of OFAC on other committees, such as Licence Review, Lake Huron Management Committee; 2) Council initiative resulting in a committee report on suggested Guidelines for Competitive Fishing (Derbies and Tournaments); 3) Regular updates from Ministry per-

sonnel on SPOF II documents, Ministry reorganization and relocation, and specific initiatives and problems of different MNR Regions; 4) Review of and response to draft policy documents, such as SPOF II, Fish Culture Review, Review of CFIP program, Forestry Management, Lake Trout Backcross Program Review, Lake Sturgeon Management Policy; 5) The Greening of Shorelands; 6) Charter Boats and Charter Boat Fishery; and 7) Ecological Security and Sustainable Development.

## E. PUBLIC CONTACT WITH THE COUNCIL

A significant number of letters to the Council, both from residents of Ontario and the United States, continue to involve topics outside the advertised mandate of the Council. These address specific topics such as charges for camping on Crown land, or problems in specific lakes or areas of the province. Such correspondence must be passed on to the appropriate office of the Ministry for consideration and reply.

In January, Council initiated a survey of correspondents whose comments had to be passed on to the Ministry

for a response. This survey was to determine the degree of satisfaction of the correspondents with the reply received. The result of this survey will be reported in next year's Annual Report.

All correspondents writing on subjects within our mandate are replied to directly. If the subject seemed appropriate for discussion by Council, a copy of the letter is sent to each member. Members of the Council then decide on which subjects (arising in this way) are to be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

## F. SUMMARY

The January 1991 meeting held in Toronto provided an opportunity for the Minister, Mr. Wildman, to meet the Council and to have informal discussions with various members at dinner.

The Council is required to hold no fewer than two and no more than four meetings per fiscal year. In fiscal year 1990-91, one of the three usual meetings was avoided on the basis that there was not an adequate backlog of items for discussion to warrant the expenses of a meeting. The costs of Council meetings are derived from the fisheries program and reduce the amount available for use in the program.

The Council was disappointed that the processes of choosing and officially appointing members for the Council were so protracted. Council was notified that members to replace the five retiring (mentioned above) would not be available to attend the next meeting even as observers.

As can be seen from the recommendations and ministerial responses, Council continues to search for a format that would allow MNR expenditures from "a single budget" rather than two budgets (i.e. base budget and

RSFL revenue) while providing OFAC with the assurance that the extra annual revenue from the RSFL does, in fact, *increase* the fisheries program. This annual report is the first one that reflects the results of that frustration.

Council has sought to set more rigid and earlier deadlines for various stages of the preparation of the annual report. The objective was to make the report available to the public earlier in the succeeding fiscal year. Problems with the new reporting format, translation, and competing responsibilities and time taken in translation have combined to prevent that.

Section D of this annual report includes some indication of items treated at OFAC meetings that do not fall in the more formal category of OFAC recommendations and Minister's responses (Section C). Important aspects of the function of the Council fall outside its recommendations to the Minister. They include the involvement of the OFAC, by representation, with other management committees, and lengthy responses of Council to various draft policy statements placed before it for review (Item 3 in the Terms of Reference of OFAC).



#### D. AUTRES ACTIVITÉS DU CONSEIL

## E. RAPPORTS ENTRE LE PUBLIC ET LE CONSEIL

## REPLIQUE DU MINISTRE

## 112. PHILOSOPHIE DU CONSEIL EN CE QUI A TRAIT AU PROGRAMME DES PPSR

## REPONSE DU MINISTRE

Le Conseil a exprimé son inquiétude au sujet du conflit d'intérêt qui pourrait exister du fait que le ministre est responsable des affaires autochtones et de la gestion des ressources naturelles.

## 11. AFFAIRES AUTOCHTONES ET QUESTIONS PORTANT SUR LES PECHEES

Le ministère de l'Énergie a assister à une réunion dans le développement des projets hydro-électriques. L'encouragement à l'innovation et l'exploration des sources d'énergie renouvelable sont les deux principaux objectifs du ministère de l'Énergie. Le ministère de l'Énergie a également discuté des questions relatives à l'exploitation et à la gestion des projets hydro-électriques. L'objectif principal est de promouvoir l'innovation et l'exploration des sources d'énergie renouvelable. Le ministère de l'Énergie a également discuté des questions relatives à l'exploitation et à la gestion des projets hydro-électriques. L'objectif principal est de promouvoir l'innovation et l'exploration des sources d'énergie renouvelable.

“Je comprends les proclamations du Conseil communal de la Protection des ressources halieutiques contre les effets possibles des projets hydro-électriques, mais je ne suis pas d'accord avec les méthodes utilisées pour les empêcher. Il est nécessaire de faire en sorte que les deux objectifs puissent coexister.”

## RÉPONSE DU MINISTRE

Le Conseil se préoccupé des effets nuisibles potentiels des projets hydro-électriques sur les ressources halieutiques et a fait la recommandation suivante :

## 10. Projets hydro-électriques et pêches

Par conséquent, il est peu probable que le rapport soit discuté pour la réunion de juin du Conseil. Une ébauche du rapport devrait être disponible d'ici Août».

## RÉPONSE DU MINISTRE

donne la possibilité de faire part de ses commentaires sur le budget du rapport de cette étude des permis, lors de la réunion du Conseil en juin 1991.

1/ L'augmentation des droits entraînera la réduction des possibilités de dépêche à la ligne et entraînera la promotion des remises à l'eau des passagers, par conséquent, elle doit être prise en considération.

les commentaires du public;

Etudes en même temps.

4. Les permis relatifs à la faune et les droits doivent être

3. L'étude des droits de délivrance des permis de pêche fait partie du mandat du Conselli.

2. Le Conseil n'est pas représenté au comité d'étude;

1. Le mandat du comité a échu le 1er juillet 1987 et des recommandations qu'il a formulées.

2. L'étude des permis de pêche effectuée par le Conseil en 1987 et des recommandations qu'il a formulées.

## 9. ETUDE DES PERMIS DE PECHE

J'estime que la meilleure façon de mesurer en œuvre ce programme éducatif dans nos écoles, ainsi que les projets d'autorégulation et d'objectifs est d'organiser des séances régulières pour les enseignants sur l'utilisation des manuels. Les recherches effectuées dans les écoles du nouveau matériel pédagogique dans les écoles appuient ce point de vue. Comme le matériel pédagogique appuie

des œuvres de l'art contemporain. Ces dernières sont exposées dans des lieux de la ville, dans des établissements publics et privés, dans des espaces culturels et dans des lieux de vie. Le programme d'éducation et de sensibilisation au patrimoine culturel et à l'art contemporain est mis en œuvre par le biais de séances de découverte et de sensibilisation, de conférences, de débats et de visites guidées. Ces activités sont destinées à tous les publics, de l'enfant au adulte, et visent à promouvoir la culture et l'art contemporain dans la ville et au-delà.

## REPRÉSENTATION DU MINISTRE

ministre de l'Éducation pour s'assurer que le FESF est mis en œuvre efficacement dans les écoles.

1. Pour aider les enseignants dans la mise en œuvre du [CCSNA](#)

PFCHEs

#### 8. PROGRAMME D'EDUCATION SCOLAIRE SUR LES

Le Conseil des services sociaux de la région de Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean a été créé en 1995. Il a pour mandat de mettre en œuvre la Politique régionale des services sociaux et de faire en sorte que les services sociaux soient accessibles à tous les citoyens de la région. Le Conseil a pour objectif de promouvoir l'autonomie et l'intégrité de l'individu, de favoriser l'insertion sociale et professionnelle, de protéger les personnes vulnérables et de promouvoir la sécurité sociale.

Le Conseil a également demandé une description d'un budget "détailé", le recours auxquels il intitulera les programmes de financement de ses fonctionnements et de ses ressources. Il devrait dans la province contribuerait à la création d'un nouvel outil pour aider les organismes de gestion des sociétés d'État à établir des contrats de millions de dollars. Cependant, je suis persuadé que le Plan d'aménagement des pêches de l'Ontario progressera, dans une large mesure, sans programme dédié aux sociétés d'État. Les ministères chargés de la mise en œuvre du PPO ont demandé que ces dernières obtiennent des crédits supplémentaires pour leurs programmes. Ces dernières ont déj à la situation économique et du besoin complet de mesures comparables avec la gestion des sociétés d'État. Les ministères ont demandé que le PPO soit étendu à une autre période de temps.

## REPLIQUE DU MINISTRE

#### 1. LE BUDGET «IDÉAL» DES PECHE

REPOUSE DU MINISTRE

### 6. DOCUMENTATION SUR LES PECHEES POUR LES

Les prédicts noms des vues ou curiosités du paysage et de la recette de la touraine, à l'usage des guides de la grande distribution, sont également indiqués.

RESPONSE DU MINISTRE

3. ELUDE DU TÉLÉGRAMME





#### 4. EXAMEN DU PROGRAMME SUR LES PECHEES

Volume	1986-1987	1987-1988	1988-1989	1989-1990	1990-1991
Administration	36,7	29,6	23,8	20,0	25,0
Inventaire et évaluation	13,9	18,6	17,9	23,0	16,6
Gestion des populations	11,9	10,0	10,2	7,0	8,1
Applications	2,7	10,4	18,7	19,5	24,0
Services au public	3,7	5,0	4,8	4,1	4,4
Recherches sur les pêches	5,8	6,1	6,8	8,3	5,7
Préseiculture/Emplois saisonniers	12,6	11,2	11,2	12,2	9,4
Immobilisations ménagères	12,6	9,1	6,5	5,9	6,6
Budget total des dépenses (en millions de dollars)	39,2 \$	46,6 \$	49,9 \$	51,5 \$	57,9 \$

TABLEAU 5 TOTAL DES DÉPENSES EN POURCENTAGE DU SEUL BUDGET DES PÉCHES

Le programme de formation continue de la fonction publique (PFP) a été mis en place en 1989-1990. Il vise à assurer la formation continue des fonctionnaires et à leur permettre de maintenir et d'améliorer leurs compétences. Le PFP offre diverses formations, dont des formations théoriques et pratiques, ainsi que des formations en ligne. Les formations sont généralement dispensées par des experts en la matière et sont conçues pour répondre aux besoins spécifiques de chaque fonctionnaire. Le PFP offre également des formations en ligne, ce qui facilite l'accès à la formation continue pour les fonctionnaires qui ne peuvent pas se déplacer physiquement.

1 ABLEAU 4 BUDGET DES PECHE

POUR L'EXERCICE FINANCIER 1990-1991

DEPENSES EN % DU TOTAL (57,9 MILLIONS DE DOLLARS) PAR VOLLET ET PAR RÉGION

• **प्राप्ति:** यह विवरण विविध सम्पर्कों के द्वारा प्राप्ति की जाती है।

Étude des populations de possesseurs de bateaux nautiques, y compris les habitudes de consommation et l'évaluation des populations. Invénierie de l'habitat aquatique, les enquêtes des utilisateurs et les unités d'évaluation.

gestion des pechés (PPCGP), programmes d'éducation, zones provinciales de peche, participation du public et programme

Depenses affranchies aux locaux d'entrepôtage et aux bureaux affectés au démantèlement des installations de production et de stockage de pétrole et de gazières.

Las regiones más grandes en población son:	AL, AR, BE, BR, CH, CL, CO, CR, CU, DE, ES, FR, GR, HK, ID, IL, IN, JP, KR, LV, MA, ME, MN, NL, NO, PT, RU, SE, SI, TW, TR, VE, ZA
Las regiones más grandes en extensión son:	AS, AU, BR, CA, CH, CL, CO, CR, CU, DE, ES, FR, GR, HK, ID, IL, IN, JP, KR, LV, MA, ME, MN, NL, NO, PT, RU, SE, SI, TW, TR, VE, ZA
Las regiones más densamente pobladas son:	AS, AU, BE, BR, CH, CL, CO, CR, CU, DE, ES, FR, GR, HK, ID, IL, IN, JP, KR, LV, MA, ME, MN, NL, NO, PT, RU, SE, SI, TW, TR, VE, ZA
Las regiones más extensas son:	AS, AU, BR, CA, CH, CL, CO, CR, CU, DE, ES, FR, GR, HK, ID, IL, IN, JP, KR, LV, MA, ME, MN, NL, NO, PT, RU, SE, SI, TW, TR, VE, ZA
Las regiones más densamente pobladas en el mundo son:	AS, AU, BE, BR, CH, CL, CO, CR, CU, DE, ES, FR, GR, HK, ID, IL, IN, JP, KR, LV, MA, ME, MN, NL, NO, PT, RU, SE, SI, TW, TR, VE, ZA
Las regiones más extensas en el mundo son:	AS, AU, BR, CA, CH, CL, CO, CR, CU, DE, ES, FR, GR, HK, ID, IL, IN, JP, KR, LV, MA, ME, MN, NL, NO, PT, RU, SE, SI, TW, TR, VE, ZA

LABLEAU 3 BUDGET DES PECHE\$

Exercice Financier	1986-1987	1987-1988	1988-1989	1989-1990	1990-1991
Receettes du programme de permis	0,7	8,2	9,3	10,7	10,7
Fonds provenant du programme ordinaire	31,5	35,9	36,8	39,8	41,7
Total	32,2	44,1	46,1	50,5	52,4

millions de dollars au cours de l'exercice financier 1986-1987, soit 3,8 millions de dollars au cours de l'exercice financier 1989-1990, et à 3,5 millions de dollars au cours de l'exercice financier 1990-1991. Pendant la même période, les effectifs provinciaux du programme ont diminué de 1 000 à 750 personnes. Au cours de l'exercice financier 1990-1991, le taux de change des millions de dollars canadiens par dollar américain a été de 1,59, alors qu'il était de 1,39 au cours de l'exercice financier 1989-1990, et de 1,35 au cours de l'exercice financier 1988-1989. En outre, le taux de change des millions de dollars canadiens par dollar britannique a été de 1,42 au cours de l'exercice financier 1990-1991, alors qu'il était de 1,35 au cours de l'exercice financier 1989-1990, et de 1,32 au cours de l'exercice financier 1988-1989. Enfin, le taux de change des millions de dollars canadiens par dollar suisse a été de 1,45 au cours de l'exercice financier 1990-1991, alors qu'il était de 1,35 au cours de l'exercice financier 1989-1990, et de 1,32 au cours de l'exercice financier 1988-1989.

LE TRIBUNAL 3 COMPREND les deux critères (tous deux présents au moins une fois) suivants pour déterminer si une entreprise est une entreprise financière : 1) exercice programme de financement (tous deux présents au moins une fois) et 2) exercice programme des PSSR (tous deux présents au moins une fois). Les deux critères doivent être remplis pour que l'entreprise soit considérée comme une entreprise financière.

## B. BUDGET DES PECHE

LABELEU | RECETTES PROVENANT DES PERMIS DE PECHE SPORTIVE DE RESIDENT

Exercice financier	Permis saisonnier \$	Permis de vacation \$	Total \$	Permis cumulatif \$
1986-1987	1,4	0,0	1,4	1,4
1987-1988	9,0	0,2	9,2	10,6
1988-1989	9,3	0,2	9,5	20,1
1989-1990	9,6	0,2	9,8	29,9
1990-1991	11,2	0,3	11,5	41,4

1. ABLEAU 2 BUDGET DES PECHEES 2. CREDITS ALLOUES AU TITRE DU PROGRAMME  
DES PPSR ET DU PROGRAMME ORDINARIE  
CREDITS POUR L'EXERCICE FINANCIER 1990-1991  
Utilisez un seul budget pour les pêches en Ontario qui  
utilise des subventions et des pêches commerciales de mers

Fonds	En % du total	Millions de \$	(\$2,4 millions de \$)	PPSR	Programme ordinaire	Total (combining)
				10,7	41,7	52,4
				20,4	79,6	100,0

Pour l'exercice financier 1990-1991, et comme indiqué au Tableau 2 il a été alloué au programme sur les dépenses de maintien des infrastructures 52,4 millions de dollars (en sus du budget), provenant de sources ordinaires (41,7 millions de dollars) et des droits de permis de résidence (10,7 millions de dollars), et des recettes de permis de détails (0,7 millions de dollars) et de taxes sur les biens immobiliers (0,1 millions de dollars). Pour 100 \$ dédié à l'au détails, qu'il équivaut à 50,5 millions de dollars.

Comme nous l'avons signalé précédemment dans la section Rumeurs, une partie de la remunération versée à certains conseillers aux activités du Conseil (et non à d'autres personnes qui assure la liaison entre le programme et les partenaires) a été utilisée au programme contre les pertes de la remunération versée à d'autres personnes qui assure la liaison entre le programme et les partenaires. La partie de la remunération versée à d'autres personnes qui assure la liaison entre le programme et les partenaires a été utilisée au programme contre les pertes de la remunération versée à d'autres personnes qui assure la liaison entre le programme et les partenaires.

## 5. LIASION AUPRES DE LA DIRECTION DES POLITIQUES DES PECHEES, MRCN

### I. PERMIS (PPSR)

## 1. PERMIS DE PECHE SPORTIVE DE RESIDENT (P.P.S.R.)

Associations, de Gorge Bay, pour l'Ontario Fish Protection Society, de Lorne Laird, de Thunder Bay, de Mississauga, M. Paul DiCicco, de Niagara Falls, M. Steve Green, de Kenora, M. Tom Henderson, de Englehart, M. Marcel Harvey, d'Elliot Lake, de Peterborough, le mandat des groupes membres : MM. Patrick MacLachlan, Rick Morgan et Steve Green, Don MacLachlan, Dick DiCicco, Steve Green, le 26 juillet 1991.

### 3. MANDAT DU CONSEIL

Le Marandat du Concaill est le seul au monde à être à la fois un site naturel et un site historique.

Programme de gestion des pêches de l'Ontario.

Administratrices par le ministre et recommander des familiers

3) Examiner les principaux projets et politiques

4) Effectuer des études et tourner des conséills sur des sources nouvelles ou possibles ou recettes dans le cadre

5) Fairé des recommandations au ministre sur les

renseignements à l'intention des pêcheurs à la ligne, après l'épuisement des stocks ou communiquer des renseignements sur les pêches pour la pêche à la ligne, après

conseiller le ministre sur des questions qu'on ne lui a pas  
exprimées.

#### 4. REUNIONS

des membres du Conseil ont droit, pour les journaux qu'ils possèdent en réunion, à une indemnité journalière dont le tarif est le suivant : 225 \$ pour le président, 175 \$ pour le vice-président et 150 \$ pour les membres. Les

## 2. LE CONSEIL

9	7. LE BUDGET «IDÉAL» DES PECHEES	9
8	8. PROGRAMME D'EDUCATION SCOLAIRE SUR LES PECHEES	8
9	9. ÉTUDE DES PERMIS DE PECHE	9
10	10. PROJETS HYDRO-ELECTRIQUES ET PECHEES	10
11	11. AFFAIRES AUTOCHONES ET QUESTIONS PORTANT SUR LES PECHEES	11
12	12. PHILOSOPHIE DU CONSEIL EN CE QUI A TRAIT AU PROGRAMME DES PPSR	12
13	D. AUTRES ACTIVITÉS DU CONSEIL	13
14	E. RAPPORTS ENTRE LE PUBLIC ET LE CONSEIL	14
	F. RÉSUMÉ	

## A. INTRODUCTION

## B. BUDGET DES FÉCHES

1. PERMIS DE FÉCHE SPORTIVE	1
2. LE CONSEIL	1
3. MANDAT DU CONSEIL	1
4. RÉUNIONS	1
5. LIASISON AUPRÈS DE LA DIRECTION DES POLITIQUES DES FÉCHES, MNRD	2
1. RECETTES PROVENANT DES PSR	3
2. CRÉDITS ALLOUÉS AU TRÉSOR	3
3. DEPENSES - UTILISATION DES FONDS COMBINÉS PROVENANT DU PROGRAMME DES PSR ET DU PROGRAMME DES FÉCHES	4
4. EXAMEN DU PROGRAMME DES FONDS PROVENANT DES FÉCHES : Fusion (UN SEUL BUDGET)	6
5. RECETTES PROVENANT DES FÉCHES	6
6. DU PROGRAMME DES PSR ET DU PROGRAMME DES FONDS PROVENANT DES FÉCHES : Fusion (UN SEUL BUDGET)	7
7. A. UN SEUL BUDGET DES FÉCHES : Fusion	7
8. B. DU PROGRAMME ORDINAIRE - SUITE	7
9. C. RECOMMANDATIONS PRÉSENTÉES	7
10. D. DU MINISTRE	8

1. MANDAT DES MEMBRES DU CONSEIL	2
2. DES MOULS ZÉBREES	3
3. LUTTE CONTRE LA PROPAGATION DU PROGRAMME DES PSR	3
4. MENACE QUÉPOSE LA SALICARIE	4
5. ETUDE DU TOLADI RETROCORIÉ	6
6. DOCUMENTATION SUR LES FÉCHES	6
7. COMMUNE	8
8. 6. DOCUMENTATION SUR LES FÉCHES	9
9. 5. ETUDE DU TOLADI RETROCORIÉ	9
10. 4. MENACE QUÉPOSE LA SALICARIE	9
11. 3. LUTTE CONTRE LA PROPAGATION DU PROGRAMME DES PSR	9
12. 2. DES MOULS ZÉBREES	8
13. 1. COMMUNE	8
14. 6. DOCUMENTATION SUR LES FÉCHES	6
15. 5. ETUDE DU TOLADI RETROCORIÉ	6
16. 4. MENACE QUÉPOSE LA SALICARIE	6
17. 3. LUTTE CONTRE LA PROPAGATION DU PROGRAMME DES PSR	7
18. 2. DES MOULS ZÉBREES	7
19. 1. COMMUNE	7



CONSEIL  
CONSULTATIVE  
DE L'ONTARIO  
SUR LES PECHEs

RAPPORT ANNUEL

POUR L'EXERCICE FINANCIER ALLANT DU  
1<sup>er</sup> AVRIL 1990 AU 31 MARS 1991



## E.U. Crossman Conseil consultatif de l'Ontario sur les pêches

monogram

Le président,

Veulliez agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'expression de mon profond respect.

Programme sur les pesticides.

Le présent rapport rate d'une nouvelle approche permettant d'intégrer les résidents et les non-résidents des recettes et des dépenses du marché immobilier.

Pouvoir s'altéride.

Le largissement du programme sur les pêches au-delà de ce à quoi on a droit à venir des permis de pêche spontanés de résident inviolés ou

Les membres du Conseil gardent l'espoir que les recettes provenant

couverte par le présent rapport.

Je suis heureux de vous présenter le quatrième rapport annuel du Conseil. Tel qu'indiqué, deux ministres se sont succédé pendant la période de

Monsieur le Ministre,

L'honorable C.J. Williamson  
Ministre des Richesses naturelles  
Édifice Whistley, Queen's Park  
Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1W3

Le 16 janvier 1992

1ere copie : (416) 586-5863

Telephone : (416) 586-5759

The Royal Ontario Museum  
Dr. E.J. Crossman, Chairman  
100 Queen's Park Crescent  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5S 2C6





Tél. : (416) 314-2000

Centre d'information sur les ressources naturelles  
Ministère des Richesses naturelles  
Pour plus de renseignements,euillez communiquer avec :  
Centre d'information sur les ressources naturelles  
Ministère des Richesses naturelles  
900, rue Bay  
Édifice MacDonald Bureau M1-73  
Toronto (Ontario) M7A 2C1  
Pour plus de renseignements,euillez communiquer avec :  
Centre d'information sur les ressources naturelles  
Ministère des Richesses naturelles  
900, rue Bay  
Édifice MacDonald Bureau M1-73  
Toronto (Ontario) M7A 2C1  
Pour plus de renseignements,euillez communiquer avec :  
Centre d'information sur les ressources naturelles  
Ministère des Richesses naturelles  
900, rue Bay  
Édifice MacDonald Bureau M1-73  
Toronto (Ontario) M7A 2C1

Impression en Ontario (Canada)

© Imprimerie de la Reine pour l'Ontario, 1992

Le rapport couvre l'exercice financier 1990-1991, pendant lequel Mme Lynn McLeod a occupé ce poste du 1<sup>er</sup> avril au 6 septembre, et M. Bud Wildman du 6 septembre au 31 mars 1991. Le Conseil s'est réuni deux fois au cours de l'exercice financier 1990-1991, soit en juillet 1990 et une autre fois en janvier 1991. Bien que les recommandations du Conseil formulees lors de la réunion de juillet soient faites à l'adresse des personnes qui désirent obtenir plus d'explications par M. Bud Wildman.

Le présent rapport est présenté par le Conseil consultatif de l'Ontario sur les pêches au ministre des Richesses naturelles, l'honorable Bud Wildman.

#### NOTE EXPLICATIVE

CONSEIL CONSULTATIF DE L'ONTARIO SUR LES PÊCHES  
RAPPORT ANNUEL  
POUR L'EXERCICE FINANCIER ALLANT DU  
1<sup>er</sup> AVRIL 1990 AU 31 MARS 1991

CONSEIL  
CONSULTATIF  
DE L'ONTARIO  
SUR LES PÉCHES  
RAPPORT ANNUEL  
POUR L'EXERCICE FINANCIER ALLANT DU  
1<sup>er</sup> AVRIL 1990 AU 31 MARS 1991

31761115484339